REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 6, and 12 have been amended. The specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 12 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 12, 15, and 17, and at paragraphs [0070], [0082]-[0083], and [0100] of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

To establish an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), four factual inquiries must be examined. The four factual inquiries include (a) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (b) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (c) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (d) evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. I, 17-18 (1966). In view of these four factors, the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be made explicit, and should "identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Telefex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. __, slip op. at 14-15 (2007). Thus, even if the prior art may be combined, the references when combined must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,262,699 issued to Suzuki, *et al.* ("Suzuki") in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,525,486 issued to Awamoto, *et al.* ("Awamoto").

Suzuki and Awamoto, even if combined, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1 as amended. Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*:

> wherein ... in a mixed address-display period, a first XY electrode pair group is addressed and sustain-discharged by a first driving circuit before a second XY electrode pair group is addressed by a second driving circuit.

Even if combined, Suzuki and Awamoto fail to disclose or suggest at least these features. Rather, as shown in Suzuki's Figs. 2, 4, 6, and in Awamoto's Fig. 9, the address period and sustain discharge period are separate periods. Therefore, these references fail to disclose or suggest "a mixed address-display period," and also fail to disclose or suggest that "a first XY electrode pair group is addressed and sustain-discharged by a first driving circuit before a second XY electrode pair group is addressed by a second driving circuit" in "a mixed address-display period." (emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0057858 applied for by Lee, *et al.* ("Lee") in view of Suzuki, further in view of Awamoto.

Claim 12 has been amended consistently with claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to claim 1, Suzuki in view of Awamoto fail to disclose or suggest every feature of claim 12 as amended. Further, Lee discloses an address-display separation display method and an address-while-display driving method (see Lee, Fig. 3; Fig. 4), but fails to

disclose either "a mixed address-display period," or that "a first XY electrode pair group is addressed and sustain-discharged by a first driving circuit before a second XY electrode pair group is addressed by a second driving circuit." (emphasis added). Thus, Lee fails to disclose or suggest the shortcomings of Suzuki in view of Awamoto.

For at least these reasons, claim 12 is allowable over Lee in view of Suzuki, further in view of Awamoto.

Claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto, further in view of Lee. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,091,380 issued to Hashimoto, *et al.* ("Hashimoto").

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Suzuki in view of Awamoto, and neither Lee nor Hashimoto cures the deficiencies of Suzuki in view of Awamoto noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claims 4-7 and 11 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 12. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 12, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: January 3, 2008

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/kbs